

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were pending when last examined. With this Response, Claims 1-24 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and new Claims 25-37 have been added. All pending claims are shown in the detailed listing above.

Specification

The Examiner states, “The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.” The Examiner goes on to suggest the title of “A method to consider overlapping of non-shared applications over shared OpenGL applications in a data conference system.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The title of the present Application is “Sharing OpenGL Applications Using Application Based Screen Sampling.” As previously noted in the Response filed on January 14, 2004, such title *is* descriptive of Applicant’s invention as described and claimed, for example, in Claim 1 which recites in pertinent part “A method for sharing an application.” Moreover, the present title of the Application is more in line with the guidelines of the MPEP than the one suggested by the Examiner. In particular, regarding the title of an application, the MPEP states, “It should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words and may not contain more than 500 characters.” See MPEP § 608.01(b), ¶ 6.02. Applicant’s title is technically accurate and consists of eight words, which is very close to the preferred range of the MPEP. On the other hand, the title now suggested by the Examiner has 17 words total—i.e., more than two times as many words as the maximum of the MPEP’s recited preferred range. As such, the Examiner’s objection to the title should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objects to the abstract of the present Application. According to the Examiner, “The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is missing key terms

involved in the invention, for example, data conference system, to periodically capture of a screen shot and to transmit it to the viewer, etc.” Applicant respectfully traverses.

As discussed in Applicant’s Response filed on January 14, 2004, the patent laws do not require an Abstract to contain what the Examiner is indicating. Nor does MPEP § 608.01(b), which is cited by the Examiner to support this objection. 37 CFR § 1.72, the relevant section of the CFR, only states “The purpose of the abstract is to enable the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the public generally to determine quickly from a cursory inspection the nature and gist of the technical disclosure.” The abstract of the present Application in its current form accomplishes this. As such, there is nothing objectionable about the current abstract. The Applicant requests that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky et al. 6,343,313 (Hereinafter Salesky) in view of what Examiner refers to as “applicant’s admitted prior art (AAPA).”

Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-24 without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

New Claims

With this Response, Applicant has added new Claims 25-37. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 25-37 are fully supported by the Specification, add no new matter, and are allowable over the cited art.

At the end of the Office Action, the Examiner concludes with the following: “Examiner makes a note that the independent claims do not reflect what the applicant considers as an invention, i.e., ‘There is no way for the presenter to selectively share

application windows with the viewer. What is needed is an improved method for sharing applications during a **data conference**', page 2, lines 12-20. Also, refer to figure 6.”

Applicant notes that such concluding remarks are neither a rejection nor objection to any of the claims, but appear to be only that—remarks. Accordingly, Applicant does not believe that any response thereto is necessary.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-1200.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:
EV 305 258 452 US

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Philip W. Woo
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,880
PWW/rp

June 2, 2004

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
555 California Street, Suite 5000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-7200